



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/824,106	04/14/2004	Janaki P. Kumar	13906-171001 / 2004P00206	6151
32864	7590	11/13/2007	EXAMINER	
FISH & RICHARDSON, P.C. PO BOX 1022 MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55440-1022			COUGHLAN, PETER D	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2129	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			11/13/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/824,106

Applicant(s)

KUMAR, JANAKI P.

Examiner

Peter Coughlan

Art Unit

2129

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 28 September 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9, 13-16, 18 and 20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9, 13-16, 18 and 20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 14 April 2004 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

Detailed Action

1. This office action is in response to an AMENDMENT entered September 28, 2007 for the patent application 10/824106 filed on April 14, 2004.
2. All previous Office Actions are fully incorporated into this Final Office Action by reference.

Status of Claims

3. Claims 1-9, 13-16, 18, 20 are pending.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

4. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:
The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 1, 3, 5, 8, 18, 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application

Art Unit: 2129

was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. These claims contain the phrase 'attribute name' which is not defined within the specification. Paragraph 0023 states that an attribute 'may include any form of name to identify an attribute, such as "country" ' but fails to disclose what it actually is. As written is a 'name' merely a title without any meaning or value? Paragraph 0023 states that it 'may include any form of name to identify an attribute, such as "country" ', does this mean it may also contain a meaning or a value? Considering the fact that this term is a major element within the independent claims but lacks description within the specification explains why these claims are rejected.

These claims must be amended or withdrawn from consideration.

Claims 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 18, 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. These claims contain the word 'operator' which is not defined within the specification. Paragraph 0023 simply states that 'may include a logical or other form of operator, such as "contains.'" Which means it may not include a logical or other form of operator, such as "contains" as well. Considering the fact that this term is a major element within the independent claims but lacks description within the specification explains why these claims are rejected.

These claims must be amended or withdrawn from consideration.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1-9, 13-16, 18, 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) (hereinafter referred to as **Thurlow**) being anticipated by Thurlow et al., U.S. 6057841.

Claim 1

Thurlow anticipates displaying a graphical user interface (GUI) on a display device of a computer, the GUI including a representation of a condition of a user defined rule to process textual information and a representation of an action of a user defined rule to process the textual information (**Thurlow**, Figure 6a; 'GUI' of applicant is equivalent to the screen shot (item 600) of Thurlow.), wherein the condition includes an attribute name, an operator, and an attribute value (**Thurlow**, C10:13-25; 'Condition' of applicant is equivalent to the Boolean expression for each natural language condition or exception clause is of the form : [property], [comparison of], and [value] of Thurlow. It follows that 'attribute name' of applicant is equivalent to 'property' of Thurlow. 'Operator' of applicant is equivalent to 'comparison of' of Thurlow. 'Attribute value' of

Art Unit: 2129

applicant is equivalent to 'value' of Thurlow.) and wherein the action includes an action name and a action value(**Thurlow**, C10:26-34; 'Action' of applicant is equivalent to the machine readable format for each natural language action clause is of the form: [action], [parameter 1], [parameter 2], ..., [parameter n]. It follows that 'Action name' of applicant is equivalent to 'action' of Thurlow. 'Action value' of applicant is equivalent to 'parameter 1' of Thurlow.), receiving user input via the GUI, the user inputs indicating the user defined rule is to be used to create a rule template (**Thurlow**, C10:26-34; 'Receiving user input' of applicant is equivalent to 'the user works through the process of selecting available conditions' of Thurlow.); creating in response to the received user input, a rule template having a condition that is based upon the condition of the user defined rule and an action that is based upon the action of the user defined rule(**Thurlow**, C2:38-46, C10:26-34; Creation of a 'rule template' of applicant is illustrated by the 'construction of a rule' of Thurlow. Each rule contains at least condition and action.) , wherein the condition of the rule template includes the attribute name and the operator from the corresponding condition of the user defined rule(**Thurlow**, C10:13-25; 'Condition' of applicant is equivalent to the Boolean expression for each natural language condition or exception clause is of the form : [property], [comparison of], and [value] of Thurlow. It follows that 'attribute name' of applicant is equivalent to 'property' of Thurlow. 'Operator' of applicant is equivalent to 'comparison of' of Thurlow.), wherein the condition of the rule template further includes an attribute value placeholder that is associated with the attribute value from the corresponding condition of the user defined rule(**Thurlow**, C2:38-46, C10:13-25, C10:64 through C11:25, Figure

Art Unit: 2129

6b; 'Condition' of applicant is equivalent to the Boolean expression for each natural language condition or exception clause is of the form : [property], [comparison of], and [value] of Thurlow. It follows that 'attribute value' of applicant is equivalent to 'value' of Thurlow. 'Placeholders' of applicant is equivalent to 'variables' of Thurlow. The variables of Thurlow are indicted by the underlined portions.), wherein the action of the rule template further includes the action name from the corresponding action of the user defined rule(**Thurlow**, C2:38-46, C10:26-34, C10:64 through C11:25, Figure 6b; 'Action name' of applicant is equivalent to 'action' of Thurlow.), and wherein the action of the rule template further includes action value placeholder that is associated with the action value from the corresponding action of the user defined rule(**Thurlow**, C2:38-46, C10:13-25, C10:64 through C11:25, Figure 6b; 'Action name' of applicant is equivalent to 'action' of Thurlow. 'Placeholders' of applicant is equivalent to 'variables' of Thurlow. The variables of Thurlow are indicted by the underlined portions.), receiving a second user input that indicates a value to be used in place of the attribute value placeholder and a value to be used in place of the action value place holder (**Thurlow**, C3:22-32; Thurlow indicates that multiple users are allowed to build and edit rules. Thus 'receiving a second user input that indicates a value to be used in place of the attribute value placeholder and a value to be used in place of the action value place holder' is equivalent to allowing users to editing a rule of Thurlow.) , creating in response to the second user input, a second user defined rule to process textual information, the second user defined rule being based on the rule template and including the value to be used in place of the attribute value placeholder and the value to be used in place of the

Art Unit: 2129

action value placeholder(**Thurlow**, C3:22-32; Thurlow indicates that multiple users are allowed to build and edit rules. Thus 'creating in response to the second user input, a second user defined rule to process textual information' is equivalent to users editing a rule of Thurlow.), storing the second user defined rule in a computer readable medium on a storage device for later use in processing textual information(**Thurlow**, C2:19-46; 'Storing' of applicant is equivalent to 'the rule is then stored' of Thurlow.), wherein the second user defined rule includes a condition that includes the attribute name of the condition of the rule template, the operator of the condition of the rule template, an attribute value corresponding to the value to be used in place of the attribute value placeholder(**Thurlow**, C10:13-25, C10:64 through C11:25; 'Condition' of applicant is equivalent to the Boolean expression for each natural language condition or exception clause is of the form : [property], [comparison of], and [value] of Thurlow. It follows that 'attribute name' of applicant is equivalent to 'property' of Thurlow. 'Operator' of applicant is equivalent to 'comparison of' of Thurlow. 'Attribute value' of applicant is equivalent to 'value' of Thurlow. 'Placeholders' of applicant is equivalent to 'variables' of Thurlow. The variables of Thurlow are indicated by the underlined portions.), and wherein the second user defined rule further includes an action that includes the action name of the action of the rule template and an action value corresponding to the value to be used in place of the action value placeholder (**Thurlow**, C10:26-34, C10:64 through C11:25; 'Action' of applicant is equivalent to the machine readable format for each natural language action clause is of the form: [action], [parameter 1], [parameter 2], ..., [parameter n]. It follows that 'Action name' of applicant is equivalent to 'action' of

Art Unit: 2129

Thurlow. 'Action value' of applicant is equivalent to 'parameter 1' of Thurlow. .
'Placeholders' of applicant is equivalent to 'variables' of Thurlow. The variables of Thurlow are indicted by the underlined portions.), using the second user defined rule to process incoming textual information received from a customer system (**Thurlow**, C1:22-54; 'Textual information' of applicant is equivalent to 'e-mail' of Thurlow.), and triggering the action of the second user defined rule when the incoming textual information satisfies the condition of the second user defined rule. (**Thurlow**, C1:22-54; 'Triggering the action' of applicant is equivalent to 'automatically execute specific tasks' of Thurlow. 'Satisfies the condition' of applicant is equivalent to 'when user provided criteria are met' of Thurlow.)

Claim 2

Thurlow anticipates wherein the storing the rule template in a computer readable medium on a storage device comprises storing the rule template in a repository that is accessible to the user. (**Thurlow**, Fig. 1; Thurlow illustrates a hard drive, magnetic disk drive, and a optical disk interface which are memory devices and are connected to the monitor which the user has access to.)

Claim 3

Thurlow anticipates wherein the user-defined rule contains a plurality of conditions that each includes an attribute name, an operator, and an attribute value. (**Thurlow**, C10:13-25; 'Condition' of applicant is equivalent to the Boolean expression

Art Unit: 2129

for each natural language condition or exception clause is of the form : [property], [comparison of], and [value] of Thurlow. It follows that 'attribute name' of applicant is equivalent to 'property' of Thurlow. 'Operator' of applicant is equivalent to 'comparison of' of Thurlow. 'Attribute value' of applicant is equivalent to 'value' of Thurlow.)

Claim 4

Thurlow anticipates wherein the conditions of the user-defined rule are connected by at least one logical operator. (**Thurlow**, C10:13-25; Thurlow illustrates the 'comparison operator' connects the 'property' and the 'value'.)

Claim 5

Thurlow anticipates wherein the rule template contains a plurality of conditions that each correspond to one of the conditions of the user-defined rule and that each include the attribute name and the operator from the corresponding condition of the user-defined rule. (**Thurlow**, C10:13-25; 'Condition' of applicant is equivalent to the Boolean expression for each natural language condition or exception clause is of the form : [property], [comparison of], and [value] of Thurlow. It follows that 'attribute name' of applicant is equivalent to 'property' of Thurlow. 'Operator' of applicant is equivalent to 'comparison of' of Thurlow.)

Claim 6

Thurlow anticipates wherein the conditions of the rule template are connected by at least one logical operator. (**Thurlow**, C10:13-25; Thurlow illustrates the 'comparison operator' connects the 'property' and the 'value'.)

Claim 7

Thurlow anticipates wherein the attribute-value placeholder in the condition of the rule template includes at least one placeholder symbol and a placeholder name.

(**Thurlow**, C2:38-46, C10:13-25, C10:64 through C11:25, Figure 6b; 'Condition' of applicant is equivalent to the Boolean expression for each natural language condition or exception clause is of the form : [property], [comparison of], and [value] of Thurlow.

'Placeholders' of applicant is equivalent to 'variables' of Thurlow. The variables of Thurlow are indicated by the underlined portions. Thus the 'symbol' of applicant is equivalent to the 'underlined portion' of the rule description. The 'placeholder name' of applicant is illustrated by the characters, which are underlined in the rule description.)

Claim 8

Thurlow anticipates wherein the placeholder name is based on the attribute name of the corresponding condition of the user-defined rule. (**Thurlow**, Figure 6b; 'Placeholder name is based on the attribute name' of applicant is illustrated in fig. 6b by having the placeholder name of 'an address list' which relates to a list of addresses.)

Claim 9

Thurlow anticipates wherein the incoming textual information comprises textual information contained in email messages or in search queries. (**Thurlow**, C1:22-54; 'Textual information' of applicant is equivalent to 'e-mail' of Thurlow.)

Claim 13

Thurlow anticipates wherein the user defined rule contains a plurality of actions that each includes an action name and a value. (**Thurlow**, C10:26-34; 'Action' of applicant is equivalent to the machine readable format for each natural language action clause is of the form: [action], [parameter 1], [parameter 2], ..., [parameter n]. It follows that 'Action name' of applicant is equivalent to 'action' of Thurlow. 'Value' of applicant is equivalent to 'parameter 1' of Thurlow.)

Claim 14

Thurlow anticipates wherein the rule template contains a plurality of actions that each correspond to one of the actions of the user defines rule and that each include the action name from the corresponding action of the user defined rule. (**Thurlow**, C15:36-47; Thurlow describes rule template which contain combinations of discrete conditions and actions.)

Claim 15

Thurlow anticipates wherein the value placeholder in the action of the rule template includes at least one placeholder symbol and a placeholder name. (**Thurlow**,

Art Unit: 2129

C2:38-46, C10:13-25, C10:64 through C11:25, Figure 6b; 'Condition' of applicant is equivalent to the Boolean expression for each natural language condition or exception clause is of the form : [property], [comparison of], and [value] of Thurlow. 'Placeholders' of applicant is equivalent to 'variables' of Thurlow. The variables of Thurlow are indicted by the underlined portions. Thus the 'symbol' of applicant is equivalent to the 'underlined portion' of the rule description. The 'placeholder name' of applicant is illustrated by the characters, which are underlined in the rule description.)

Claim 16

Thurlow anticipates wherein the placeholder name is based on the action name of the corresponding action of the user defined rule. (**Thurlow**, Figure 7b; 'Placeholder name is based on the action name' of applicant is illustrated in fig. 7b by having the placeholder name of 'hiking' which relates to a placing all emails which match a SOC hiking information to be placed within a 'hiking folder.')

Claim 18

Thurlow anticipates display a graphical user interface (GUI) on a display device of a computer, the GUI including a representation of a condition of a user defined to process textual information and a representation of an action of the user defined rule to process textual information'(**Thurlow**, Figure 6a; 'GUI' of applicant is equivalent to the screen shot (item 600) of Thurlow.), wherein the condition includes an attribute name, an operator, and an attribute value (**Thurlow**, C10:13-25; 'Condition' of applicant is

Art Unit: 2129

equivalent to the Boolean expression for each natural language condition or exception clause is of the form : [property], [comparison of], and [value] of Thurlow. It follows that 'attribute name' of applicant is equivalent to 'property' of Thurlow. 'Operator' of applicant is equivalent to 'comparison of' of Thurlow. 'Attribute value' of applicant is equivalent to 'value' of Thurlow.) and, wherein the action includes an action name and an action value(**Thurlow**, C10:26-34; 'Action' of applicant is equivalent to the machine readable format for each natural language action clause is of the form: [action], [parameter 1], [parameter 2], ..., [parameter n]. It follows that 'Action name' of applicant is equivalent to 'action' of Thurlow. 'Action value' of applicant is equivalent to 'parameter 1' of Thurlow.); receive user input via the GUI, the user input indicating the user defined rule is to be used to create a rule template(**Thurlow**, C10:26-34; 'Receiving user input' of applicant is equivalent to 'the user works through the process of selecting available conditions' of Thurlow.); create, in response to the received user input, a rule template having a condition that is based upon the condition of the user defined rule and an action that is based upon the action of the user defined rule(**Thurlow**, C2:38-46, C10:26-34; Creation of a 'rule template' of applicant is illustrated by the 'construction of a rule' of Thurlow. Each rule contains at least condition and action.), wherein the condition of the rule template includes the attribute name and the operator from the corresponding condition of the user defined rule(**Thurlow**, C10:13-25; 'Condition' of applicant is equivalent to the Boolean expression for each natural language condition or exception clause is of the form : [property], [comparison of], and [value] of Thurlow. It follows that 'attribute name' of applicant is equivalent to

Art Unit: 2129

'property' of Thurlow. 'Operator' of applicant is equivalent to 'comparison of' of Thurlow.), wherein the condition of the rule template further includes an attribute value placeholder that is associated with the attribute value from the corresponding condition of the user defined rule(**Thurlow**, C2:38-46, C10:13-25, C10:64 through C11:25, Figure 6b; 'Condition' of applicant is equivalent to the Boolean expression for each natural language condition or exception clause is of the form : [property], [comparison of], and [value] of Thurlow. It follows that 'attribute value' of applicant is equivalent to 'value' of Thurlow. 'Placeholders' of applicant is equivalent to 'variables' of Thurlow. The variables of Thurlow are indicted by the underlined portions.); wherein the action of the rule template further includes the action name from the corresponding action of the user defined rule (**Thurlow**, C2:38-46, C10:26-34, C10:64 through C11:25, Figure 6b; 'Action name' of applicant is equivalent to 'action' of Thurlow.), and wherein the action of the rule template further includes action value placeholder that is associated with the action value from the corresponding action of the user defined rule (**Thurlow**, C2:38-46, C10:13-25, C10:64 through C11:25, Figure 6b; 'Action name' of applicant is equivalent to 'action' of Thurlow. 'Placeholders' of applicant is equivalent to 'variables' of Thurlow. The variables of Thurlow are indicted by the underlined portions.); receive a second user input that indicates a value to be used in place of the attribute value placeholder and a value to be used in place of the action value placeholder(**Thurlow**, C3:22-32; Thurlow indicates that multiple users are allowed to build and edit rules. Thus 'receiving a second user input that indicates a value to be used in place of the attribute value placeholder and a value to be used in place of the action value place holder' is

Art Unit: 2129

equivalent to allowing users to editing a rule of Thurlow.); create in response to the second user input, a second user defined rule to process textual information, the second user defined rule being based on the rule template and including the value to be used in place of the attribute value placeholder and the value to be used in place of the action value placeholder(**Thurlow**, C3:22-32; Thurlow indicates that multiple users are allowed to build and edit rules. Thus 'creating in response to the second user input, a second user defined rule to process textual information' is equivalent to users editing a rule of Thurlow.); storing the second user defined rule in computer readable medium on a storage device for later use in processing textual information (**Thurlow**, C2:19-46; 'Storing' of applicant is equivalent to 'the rule is then stored' of Thurlow.), wherein the second user defined rule includes a condition that includes the attribute name of the condition of the rule template, the operator of the condition of the attribute value placeholder (**Thurlow**, C10:13-25, C10:64 through C11:25; 'Condition' of applicant is equivalent to the Boolean expression for each natural language condition or exception clause is of the form : [property], [comparison of], and [value] of Thurlow. It follows that 'attribute name' of applicant is equivalent to 'property' of Thurlow. 'Operator' of applicant is equivalent to 'comparison of' of Thurlow. 'Attribute value' of applicant is equivalent to 'value' of Thurlow. 'Placeholders' of applicant is equivalent to 'variables' of Thurlow. The variables of Thurlow are indicted by the underlined portions.), and wherein the second user defined rule further includes an action that includes the action name of the action of the rule template and an action value corresponding to the value to be used in place of the action value placeholder (**Thurlow**, C10:26-34, C10:64 through

Art Unit: 2129

C11:25; 'Action' of applicant is equivalent to the machine readable format for each natural language action clause is of the form: [action], [parameter 1], [parameter 2], ..., [parameter n]. It follows that 'Action name' of applicant is equivalent to 'action' of Thurlow. 'Action value' of applicant is equivalent to 'parameter 1' of Thurlow. .

'Placeholders' of applicant is equivalent to 'variables' of Thurlow. The variables of Thurlow are indicted by the underlined portions.), using the second user defined rule to process incoming textual information received from a customer system (**Thurlow**, C1:22-54; 'Textual information' of applicant is equivalent to 'e-mail' of Thurlow.); and triggering the action of the second user defined rule when the incoming textual information satisfies the condition of the second user defined rule. (**Thurlow**, C1:22-54; 'Triggering the action' of applicant is equivalent to 'automatically execute specific tasks' of Thurlow. 'Satisfies the condition' of applicant is equivalent to 'when user provided criteria are met' of Thurlow.)

Claim 20

Thurlow anticipates display of a graphical user interface (GUI) on a display device of a computer, the GUI including a representation of a condition of a user defined rule to process textual information and a representation of an action of the user defined rule to process textual information (**Thurlow**, Figure 6a; 'GUI' of applicant is equivalent to the screen shot (item 600) of Thurlow.), wherein the condition includes an attribute name, an operator and a attribute value (**Thurlow**, C10:13-25; 'Condition' of applicant is equivalent to the Boolean expression for each natural language condition or exception

Art Unit: 2129

clause is of the form : [property], [comparison of], and [value] of Thurlow. It follows that 'attribute name' of applicant is equivalent to 'property' of Thurlow. 'Operator' of applicant is equivalent to 'comparison of' of Thurlow. 'Attribute value' of applicant is equivalent to 'value' of Thurlow.); receive user input via the GUI, the user input indicating the user defined rule is to be used to create a rule template (**Thurlow**, C10:26-34; 'Action' of applicant is equivalent to the machine readable format for each natural language action clause is of the form: [action], [parameter 1], [parameter 2], ..., [parameter n]. It follows that 'Action name' of applicant is equivalent to 'action' of Thurlow. 'Action value' of applicant is equivalent to 'parameter 1' of Thurlow.); create, in response to the received user input, a rule template having a condition that is based upon the condition of the user defined rule and an action that is based upon the action of the user defined rule (**Thurlow**, C2:38-46, C10:26-34; Creation of a 'rule template' of applicant is illustrated by the 'construction of a rule' of Thurlow. Each rule contains at least condition and action.), wherein the condition of the rule template includes the attribute name and the operator from the corresponding condition of the user defined rule (**Thurlow**, C10:13-25; 'Condition' of applicant is equivalent to the Boolean expression for each natural language condition or exception clause is of the form : [property], [comparison of], and [value] of Thurlow. It follows that 'attribute name' of applicant is equivalent to 'property' of Thurlow. 'Operator' of applicant is equivalent to 'comparison of' of Thurlow.), wherein the condition of the rule template further includes an attribute value placeholder that is associated with the attribute value from the corresponding condition of the user defined rule (**Thurlow**, C2:38-46, C10:13-25,

Art Unit: 2129

C10:64 through C11:25, Figure 6b; 'Condition' of applicant is equivalent to the Boolean expression for each natural language condition or exception clause is of the form : [property], [comparison of], and [value] of Thurlow. It follows that 'attribute value' of applicant is equivalent to 'value' of Thurlow. 'Placeholders' of applicant is equivalent to 'variables' of Thurlow. The variables of Thurlow are indicted by the underlined portions.), wherein the action of the rule template further includes the action name from the corresponding action of the user defined rule (**Thurlow**, C2:38-46, C10:26-34, C10:64 through C11:25, Figure 6b; 'Action name' of applicant is equivalent to 'action' of Thurlow.), and wherein the action of the rule template further includes action value placeholder that is associated with the action value from the corresponding action of the user defined rule (**Thurlow**, C2:38-46, C10:26-34, C10:64 through C11:25, Figure 6b; 'Action name' of applicant is equivalent to 'action' of Thurlow.); received a second user input that indicates a value to be used in place of the attribute value placeholder (**Thurlow**, C3:22-32; Thurlow indicates that multiple users are allowed to build and edit rules. Thus 'receiving a second user input that indicates a value to be used in place of the attribute value placeholder and a value to be used in place of the action value placeholder' is equivalent to allowing users to editing a rule of Thurlow.); and create in response to the second user input, a second user defined rule to process textual information, the second user defined rule being based on the rule template and including the value to be used in place of the attribute value placeholder and the value to be used in place of the action value placeholder (**Thurlow**, C3:22-32; Thurlow indicates that multiple users are allowed to build and edit rules. Thus 'creating in

Art Unit: 2129

response to the second user input, a second user defined rule to process textual information' is equivalent to users editing a rule of Thurlow.); storing the second user defined rule in computer readable medium on a storage device for later use in processing textual information (**Thurlow**, C2:19-46; 'Storing' of applicant is equivalent to 'the rule is then stored' of Thurlow.), wherein the second user defined rule includes a condition that includes the attribute name of the condition of the rule template, the operator of the condition of the rule template, an attribute value corresponding to the value to be used in place of the attribute value placeholder (**Thurlow**, C10:13-25, C10:64 through C11:25; 'Condition' of applicant is equivalent to the Boolean expression for each natural language condition or exception clause is of the form : [property], [comparison of], and [value] of Thurlow. It follows that 'attribute name' of applicant is equivalent to 'property' of Thurlow. 'Operator' of applicant is equivalent to 'comparison of' of Thurlow. 'Attribute value' of applicant is equivalent to 'value' of Thurlow. 'Placeholders' of applicant is equivalent to 'variables' of Thurlow. The variables of Thurlow are indicted by the underlined portions.), and wherein the second user defined rule further includes an action that includes the action name of the action of the rule template and an action value corresponding to the value to be used in place of the action value placeholder (**Thurlow**, C10:26-34, C10:64 through C11:25; 'Action' of applicant is equivalent to the machine readable format for each natural language action clause is of the form: [action], [parameter 1], [parameter 2], ..., [parameter n]. It follows that 'Action name' of applicant is equivalent to 'action' of Thurlow. 'Action value' of applicant is equivalent to 'parameter 1' of Thurlow. . 'Placeholders' of applicant is

Art Unit: 2129

equivalent to 'variables' of Thurlow. The variables of Thurlow are indicted by the underlined portions.); using the second user defined rule to process incoming textual information received from a customer system (**Thurlow**, C1:22-54; 'Textual information' of applicant is equivalent to 'e-mail' of Thurlow.); and triggering the action of the second user defined rule when the incoming textual information satisfies the condition of the second user defined rule. (**Thurlow**, C1:22-54; 'Triggering the action' of applicant is equivalent to 'automatically execute specific tasks' of Thurlow. 'Satisfies the condition' of applicant is equivalent to 'when user provided criteria are met' of Thurlow.)

Response to Arguments

5. Applicant's arguments filed on September 28, 2007 for claims 1-9, 13-16, 18, 20 have been fully considered but are not persuasive.

6. In reference to the Applicant's argument:

REMARKS

In view of the following remarks and the foregoing amendments, reconsideration and allowance are respectfully requested.

Claims 1-9, 13-16, 18, and 20 were pending at the time of this action, with Claims 1, 18, and 20 being independent. Claims 10-12, 17, 19, and 21 were previously cancelled. Claim 18 is amended to correct an informality. No new matter has been added. Claims 1-9, 13-16, 18, and 20 are currently pending.

35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph - Claims 1, 3, 5, 8, 18, 20

Art Unit: 2129

Claims 1, 3, 5, 8, 18, 20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as allegedly failing to comply with the written description requirement. The Office Action alleges that claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. In particular, the Office Action alleges that the "attribute name" is not defined in the specification because the specification fails to disclose what it actually is because it "may not form a name to identify an attribute" (office action: page 3).

However, the "attribute name" is clearly described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventors had possession of the claimed invention. For example, "attribute name 104" is clearly described in Fig. 2A (p.4, lines 24-31; p. 5, lines 1-7, 24-25), "attribute name 208" is clearly described in Fig. 2B (p. 6, lines 10- 18), "attribute name 208" is clearly described in Fig. 2C (p. 6, lines 19-30), and other parts of the disclosure. In these embodiments, the description of the "attribute name" is not questionable in terms of what "may" or "may not" be described as in the Office Action (p. 3), but is clearly shown and described in these embodiments in such a way to one skilled in the relevant art.

Furthermore, in making the claim rejections under 35 U.S.C. 112, the Office Action alleges that one skilled in the art would understand that the "attribute name" would be the "equivalent to 'property' of Thurlow" (Office action: p. 4, paragraph 3; p. 21, paragraph 3). Hence, the Office Action itself later acknowledges that one skilled in the art would indeed reasonably understand the "attribute name" as described and shown throughout the specification.

For at least these reasons, the rejection to claims 1, 3, 5, 8, 18, 20 under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, should be withdrawn.

Examiner's response:

¶ 13. applies. Figures 2A, 2B and 2C do not define 'attribute name.' Page 5:3-7 state 'attribute name 104 may include any form of name to identify an attribute, such as "country".' This does not limit what 'attribute name' could mean and could have additional undeclared meanings which might result in additional undisclosed uses for the invention. Page 5:24-25 only mention the term 'attribute name.' Page 6:10-18 merely mention the term 'attribute name' without disclosing a specific domain for the

Art Unit: 2129

term and the same argument true for p6:19-30. The Examiner is allowed the broadest interpretation of a claim and thus uses 'property' of Thurlow. The problem is on page 5:3-7 which allows for undisclosed definitions thus resulting in undisclosed purposes or functions. Office Action stands.

7. In reference to the Applicant's argument:

35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph - Claims 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 18, 20

Claims 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 8, 18, 20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as allegedly failing to comply with the written description requirement. The Office Action alleges that claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. In particular, the Office Action alleges that the word "operator" is not defined in the specification because the specification fails to disclose what it actually is because it "may" or "may not include a logical or other form of operator" (office action: page 3).

However, the word "operator" is clearly described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventors had possession of the claimed invention. For example, the "operator 106" is clearly described in Fig. 2A (p.4, lines 24-31; p. 5, lines 1-7, 24-25), the "operator 106" is clearly described in Fig. 2C (p. 7, lines 1-26), and other parts of the disclosure (e.g., Fig. 3 shows and describes "operator 318", Fig. 4 shows and describes "operator 318"). In these embodiments, the description of the "operator" cannot be questionable in terms of what "may" or "may not" be described as in the Office Action (p. 3) since it is clearly shown and described in these embodiments in such a way to one skilled in the relevant art.

Furthermore, in making the claim rejections under 35 U.S.C. 112, the Office Action alleges that one skilled in the art would understand that the "operator" would be the "equivalent to 'comparison of' of Thurlow" (Office action: p. 4, paragraph 3; p. 21, paragraph 3). Hence, the Office Action itself later acknowledges that one skilled in the art would indeed reasonably understand the word "operator" as described and shown throughout the specification.

For at least these reasons, the rejection to claims 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 8, 18, 20 under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, should be withdrawn.

Art Unit: 2129

Examiner's response:

¶ 13. applies. The figures only illustrate where this term 'operator' is used within relationship other terms and does not define the term at all. Page 5:1-7 do not set definite parameters on the domain of the term 'operator.' The sentence 'The operator 106 may include a logical or other form of operator such as "contains".' This could mean the 'operator' could be a 'Boolean function', or a traditional function. There is nothing limiting the 'operator' so that it could be a 'macro' such as a 'spell checker' or even an application such as a spread sheet. This limitation is so broad the specification only touches what it could mean. Office Action stands.

8. In reference to the Applicant's argument:

35 U.S.C. 102(b) - Claims 1-9 13-16, 18, and 20

Claims 1-9, 13-16, 18, and 20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by Thurlow et al., U.S.P.N. 6,057,841 (hereinafter referred to as "Thurlow"). Applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of these rejections because Thurlow does not disclose or suggest each and every feature of independent claims 1, 18 and 20.

Claim I recites a computer-implemented method that displays a graphical user interface (GUI) on a display device of a computer, where the GUI includes a representation of a condition and a representation of an action of a user-defined rule to process textual information. The condition includes an attribute name, an operator, and an attribute value, and the action includes an action name and an action value. The method also includes receiving, via the GUI, user input that indicates the user-defined rule is to be used to create a rule template and, in response, creating a rule template. The rule template has a condition that is based upon the condition of the user-defined rule and has an action that is based upon the action of the user-defined rule. The condition of the rule template includes, among other elements, an attribute-value placeholder that is associated with the attribute value from the corresponding condition of the user-defined

Art Unit: 2129

rule. The action of the rule template further includes, among other elements, an action-value placeholder that is associated with the action value from the corresponding action of the user-defined rule. The method also includes receiving a second user input that indicates a value to be used in place of the attribute-value placeholder and a value to be used in place of the action-value placeholder, and, in response, creating and storing a second user-defined rule to process textual information. The second user-defined rule is based on the rule template and includes the value to be used in place of the attribute-value placeholder and a value to be used in place of the action-value placeholder. The method further recites using the second user-defined rule to process incoming textual information received from a customer system and triggering the action of the second user-defined rule when the incoming textual information satisfies the condition of the second user-defined rule.

The Office Action asserts that Thurlow discloses all of the features of claim 1, and refers to col. 1:22-54, 2: 19:46, 3:22-32, 10:13-34, 10:64 through 11:25 and Fig. 6b for this disclosure. However, even assuming for the sake of response that this assertion is correct, Applicant submits that Thurlow does not disclose or properly suggest all of the features of claim 1. For example, Thurlow fails to disclose the features of "creating, in response to the received user input, a rule template having a condition that is based upon the condition of the user-defined rule," as recited in independent claim 1.

Instead, Thurlow discloses techniques for processing electronic messages by applying a rule representing a combination of additions, actions, or exceptions (Thurlow: Abstract). In particular, Thurlow discloses a method and system for creating and editing rules for electronic messages, such as for "OUTLOOK 97" by Microsoft Corporation of Redmond, Washington (Col. 3: lines 23-31). Thurlow discloses a "Rules Wizard" that "divides the process into discrete steps and provides a user-friendly interface for creating and editing rules," where "at each step the user selects the parameters that constitute the rule." (Thurlow: Col. 9, lines 18-35). Fig. 5 shows a state diagram for the various discrete, sequential steps used in the Rules Wizard to create a new rule or edit or rename an existing rule (Thurlow: Col. 10:48-63). These discrete, sequential steps are shown in the example diagrams of Figs. 6a, 6b, 6c, 7a, 7b, 7c, 8a, 8b, 8c, 9a, and 9b. However, none of these discrete, sequential steps in Thurlow show the claim features of "creating, in response to the received user input, a rule template having a condition that is based upon the condition of the user-defined rule," as recited in independent claim 1. These claim features are absent from Thurlow. Claim 1 is patentable over Thurlow for at least this reason alone.

Examiner's response:

The applicant claims the statement 'a rule template having a condition that is based upon the condition of the user defined rule' of the specification is different then '

Art Unit: 2129

rules wizards that divides the process into discrete steps and provides a user a friendly interface for creating and editing rules where at each step the user selects the parameters that constitute the rule' of the reference art. Both have a rule template (equivalent to 'rules wizard' of Thurlow). The applicant's statement 'the condition of the user defined rule' is equivalent to 'creating and editing rules where at each step the user selects the parameters that constitute the rule' of Thurlow. The Examiner does not see any missing information or incorrectly mapped information from the claims and the reference art. Office Action stands.

9. In reference to the Applicant's argument:

Page 5 of Office Action pointed to Cols. 2:38-46 and 10:26-34 of Thurlow for allegedly disclosing this feature of claim 1. Thurlow discloses the following in the cited sections.

In another aspect, the present invention provides a method for constructing a rule for processing electronic messages. The method includes displaying a list of rule templates and receiving an input signal indicating the selection of one of the rule templates. A condition and action associated with the selected template are then displayed. The current state of the rule is displayed in a natural language format.

The rule is then stored for subsequent processing of electronic messages. Thurlow, 2:38-46.

The machine-readable format for each natural language action clause is of the form: [ACTION] [PARAMETER 1] [PARAMETER 2] [...] where ACTION is an identifier for the selected action and PARAMETER N is a parameter associated with the action. For example, the PARAMETER may be the identifier of the folder into which matching messages are to be filed. Thurlow, 10:26-34.

Hence, Thurlow does not disclose or even teach each and every feature of claim 1. For example, Thurlow does not disclose a user "creating ...a rule template," as in claim 1. Instead, Thurlow discloses that a user views a displayed list of templates and selects one of the listed templates, as shown above (Thurlow: 2:38-46). The role templates are

Art Unit: 2129

pre-existing and pre-created before the user views the displayed list. Hence, Thurlow fails to disclose a method that includes "creating, in response to the received user input, a rule template having a condition that is based upon the condition of the user-defined rule." Claim 1 is patentable over Thurlow for this reason alone.

Examiner's response:

¶ 13. applies. Applicant states that Thurlow does not disclose the creation of a template. A template can be used for simplified use of employing rule creation (Thurlow, 9:18-41) but rules can be edited/modified (Thurlow, C17:44-61). Templates do not solve problems with a given set of parameters, rules do. Since editing can be accomplished with Thurlow in regards to a template, there is only need for a single template Thurlow which can cover all requirements as needed due to the fact editing a template is available. If the applicant feels the Examiner is incorrect with the mapping of elements in this and previous actions and continues forward with the current argument, the Examiner will use the concept of 'classes' in a object oriented programming language such as C++ or Java to be equivalent to 'templates.' The Examiner feels the difference is a matter of viewpoint at this time. Office Action stands.

10. In reference to the Applicant's argument:

Furthermore, Thurlow fails to disclose "creating, in response to the received user input, a rule template having a condition that is based upon the condition of the user-defined rule and an action that is based upon the action of the user-defined rule," as recited in claim 1. So, not only does Thurlow fails to disclose a user creating a rule template, Thurlow further fails to disclose doing so based on selecting an existing rule. There is no disclosure of a rule template being created based upon an existing rule in Thurlow.

Art Unit: 2129

Instead, Thurlow discloses that a rule is created based upon selecting a displayed list of pre-existing rule templates (Thurlow: 2:3 8-46). "The rule is then stored for subsequent processing of electronic messages" (Thurlow, 2:44-46). Hence, Thurlow discloses that the rules themselves can be created from pre-existing templates and then stored for later use. However, Thurlow does not disclose that the templates themselves are created based on pre-existing rules and then subsequently stored for later use. This is another distinction that Thurlow fails to disclose or teach, for which claim 1 should be allowed.

Therefore, for at least these reasons, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claim 1 and claims 4, 6 and 9, which depend from claim 1. Independent claims 18 and 20, although different in scope from claim 1 and each other, recite subject matter similar to that in claim 1 discussed above. In accordance with the above, Applicant submits that Thurlow does not disclose or properly suggest at least these features of independent claims 18 and 20, so that claims 18 and 20 are allowable for at least this reason.

Examiner's response:

Being able to edit or create a rule illustrates the existence of a rule template.

(Thurlow, C17:44-61) Office Action stands.

Examination Considerations

11. The claims and only the claims form the metes and bounds of the invention.

"Office personnel are to give the claims their broadest reasonable interpretation in light of the supporting disclosure. *In re Morris*, 127 F.3d 1048, 1054-55, 44USPQ2d 1023, 1027-28 (Fed. Cir. 1997). Limitations appearing in the specification but not recited in the claim are not read into the claim. *In re Prater*, 415 F.2d, 1393, 1404-05, 162 USPQ 541, 550-551 (CCPA 1969)" (MPEP p 2100-8, c 2, I 45-48; p 2100-9, c 1, I 1-4). The

Art Unit: 2129

Examiner has the full latitude to interpret each claim in the broadest reasonable sense.

Examiner will reference prior art using terminology familiar to one of ordinary skill in the art. Such an approach is broad in concept and can be either explicit or implicit in meaning.

12. Examiner's Notes are provided to assist the applicant to better understand the nature of the prior art, application of such prior art and, as appropriate, to further indicate other prior art that maybe applied in other office actions. Such comments are entirely consistent with the intent and sprit of compact prosecution. However, and unless otherwise stated, the Examiner's Notes are not prior art but link to prior art that one of ordinary skill in the art would find inherently appropriate.

13. Examiner's Opinion: Paragraphs 11 and 12 apply. The Examiner has full latitude to interpret each claim in the broadest reasonable sense.

Conclusion

14. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

15. Claims 1-9, 13-16, 18, 20 are rejected.

Correspondence Information

16. Any inquiry concerning this information or related to the subject disclosure should be directed to the Examiner Peter Coughlan, whose telephone number is (571) 272-5990. The Examiner can be reached on Monday through Friday from 7:15 a.m. to 3:45 p.m.

If attempts to reach the Examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the Examiner's supervisor David Vincent can be reached at (571) 272-3080. Any response to this office action should be mailed to:

Art Unit: 2129

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks,

Washington, D. C. 20231;

Hand delivered to:

Receptionist,

Customer Service Window,

Randolph Building,

401 Dulany Street,

Alexandria, Virginia 22313,

(located on the first floor of the south side of the Randolph Building);

or faxed to:


(571) 272-3150 (for formal communications intended for entry.)

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have any questions on access to Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll free).



Peter Coughlan

11/5/2007



JOSEPH P. HIRL
PRIMARY EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100